



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cn

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,876	08/14/2001	Ronald E. DeLuga	COMP:0264/VANP00-3821	8702

7590 02/26/2004

TAIT R. SWANSON
IP ADMINISTRATION, HEWLETT-PACKARD CO.
LEGAL DEPARTMENT MS 35
P.O. BOX 272400
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DATSKOVSKIY, MICHAEL V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2835

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/929,876

Applicant(s)

DELUGA ET AL.

Examiner

Michael V Datskovskiy

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 12-29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 14 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/09/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Although examiner agrees, that there are some differences between detailed interpretations of the applicant's proposed invention and the structure by Seto et al, the broad character of the claims 12 and 22 allows their interpretation as suitable to the description of the structure by Seto et al. Thus, applicants claim the component cover as being detachable from the device housing, which is exactly the case for Seto et al (although examiner agrees, that due to the cable 58 said cover is not detachable from the electronic device). Also the broad character of the word "cooperative" allows examiner to conclude, that preventing a cover from being lost is also a cooperative performance. Hence, the rejection of the claims 12-29 and 31 stays.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seto et al (embodiment shown in Figs.1-7).

Seto et al teach a portable computer (notebook or electronic device) 1, Figs.1-7, comprising: a portable computer housing 2 having a top deck with an opening 35 disposed over a selected components 37, 38; a display 3 coupled to the device housing by hinges 12, the display being movable to a closed position along the top deck; and a

Art Unit: 2835

component cover 21 removably mounted over the opening 35, the component cover 21 comprising a force-actuated coupling mechanism – latches 63A, 63B; and a coupling mechanism – coupling members 65A, 65B, cooperative with the force-actuated coupling mechanism to detachably mount the component cover 21 to the device housing 4, 6.

4. In addition, due to their broadness, claims 22-23 and 28-29 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by previously cited Rubenson et al, wherein the easily removable keyboard is considered as a detachable quick-release cover.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 13-15, 19, 22-25 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seto et al (embodiment shown in Figs.1-7) in view of Seto et al (embodiment shown in Figs.8-10).

Seto et al in the embodiment shown in Figs.1-7 teach all the limitation of the claims except said selected components include a network (modem) card connected to a modem card connector, a real time clock battery and a BIOS firmware hub. Seto et al in the embodiment shown in Figs.8-10 teach a portable computer (notebook or electronic device) 1, comprising: a portable computer housing 2 having a top deck with an opening 35 disposed over a selected components 83, 89 and a modem card 90 inherently

Art Unit: 2835

connected to a modem card connector; a display 3 coupled to the device housing by hinges 12, the display being movable to a closed position along the top deck; and a plastic component cover 21 mounted over the opening 35, the component cover having tool-less actuation to an open position to permit access to the selected components 83, 89 and 90. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time invention was made to employ in the embodiment shown by Seto et al in Figs.1-7 a modem card connected to a modem card connector as it is shown by Seto et al in the embodiment in Figs.8-10 or any other type of expandable or upgradeable computer components including a real time clock battery and a BIOS firmware hub in order make them easy accessible. Examiner also direct applicant's attention to the fact that they themselves indicated said network card, a real time clock battery and a BIOS firmware hub as "exemplary" (page 8, line 4 of the specification), have not disclosed that type of the computer components solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any type of the computer components accessible through said opening 35.

7. Claims 16-18, 20-21, 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seto et al in both embodiments.

Seto et al in both embodiments teach all the limitations of the claims except said component cover comprises at least one tab and at least one flexible catch disposed generally opposite the at least one tab to releasable hold the component cover over the opening. Seto et al teach tabs 62 and flexible catches (latches) 65, but instead of being located on the cover 21 they are located on the housing 4 adjacent to the opening 35. It

Art Unit: 2835

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a computer cover comprising at least one tab and at least one flexible catch disposed generally opposite the at least one tab, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167.

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Datskovsky whose telephone number is (571)272-2040. The examiner can normally be reached on Mn - Fry 8 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren E. Schuberg can be reached on (571)272-2044. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Art Unit: 2835

872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Primary Examiner

Michael Datskovsky

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Datskovsky", written in a cursive style.

February 17, 2004